



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,713	07/05/2001	Yonglin Huang	NFCS-00-014	3966

26211 7590 02/26/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
45 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUITE 2800
NEW YORK, NY 10111

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

SHAFER, RICKY D

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2872

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.
09/900,713			

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MR. ARTHUR ORTEGA (3)

(2) R.D.SHAFER (4)

Date of interview 2/13/03 & 2/14/03

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. was not reached.

Claims discussed: CLAIMS 1 AND 6

Identification of prior art discussed: SWAN ('771)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: DURING THE INTERVIEW THE EXAMINER AND MR. ORTEGA DISCUSSED THE SWAN REFERENCE IN GREAT DETAIL. MR. ORTEGA PROPOSED INCORPORATING THE LIMITATIONS OF CLAIM 6 INTO CLAIM 1. THE EXAMINER STATED THAT SUCH INCORPORATION WOULD REQUIRE FURTHER CLARIFICATION THAT THE FACES OF CORRECTION ELEMENT ARE PARALLEL TO THE INPUT FACE OF SECOND POLARIZER AND THAT THE OPTICAL PLANE OF THE CORRECTION ELEMENT IS PERPENDICULAR TO THE OPTIC AXIS OF THE SECOND POLARIZER, AS WELL AS PROVIDING PROPER CIRCULATION AND INDEXES BETWEEN THE ELEMENTS IN ORDER TO DISTINGUISH OVER THE SWAN REFERENCE. MR. ORTEGA STATED SIMILAR LIMITATIONS WOULD BE INCORPORATED IN THE OTHER INDEPENDENT CLAIMS. THE EXAMINER STATED THAT THE EXAMINER WILL PROSPECT SUCH ISSUES ONCE A PROPER RESPONSE IS PROBABLY FILED (A FULLER DESCRIPTION, IF NECESSARY, AND A COPY OF THE AMENDMENTS, IF AVAILABLE, WHICH THE EXAMINER AGREED WOULD RENDER THE CLAIMS ALLOWABLE MUST BE ATTACHED. ALSO, WHERE NO COPY OF THE AMENDMENTS WHICH WOULD RENDER THE CLAIMS ALLOWABLE IS AVAILABLE, A SUMMARY THEREOF MUST BE ATTACHED.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

R.D. Shafrazi
Examiner's Signature